



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/590,212	08/21/2006	Yehoshua Aloni	SER-112	5571
23557 7590 07/09/2008 SALIWANCHIK LLOYD & SALIWANCHIK A PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION PO BOX 142950 GAINESVILLE, FL 32614-2950				
EXAMINER				
DANG, IAN D				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1647				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/09/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

## Application No.

10/590,212

## Applicant(s)

ALONI ET AL.

## Examiner

IAN DANG

## Art Unit

1647

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 April 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 22-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 22-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 August 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/5/2008
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Status of Application, Amendments and/or Claims***

The amendment of 24 April 2008 has been entered in full. Claims 1-21 have been cancelled and claim 22 has been amended.

Claims 22-39 are under examination.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 22-39 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Novick et al. (WO 99/09063; published 02/25/1999; filed 08/13/1998) in view Shibuya et al. (US Patent 6,406,909; issued June 18, 2002, filed July 10, 1998) and Ciccarone et al. (WO 02/077202; Published 10/03/2002; cited in the IDS filed 08/12/2006 as reference F1).

At page 5 of the response, Applicants argue that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established because the concentrations of asparagine, sodium chloride, selenite, wheat hydrolysate, insulin are not recognized in the prior art as result-effective variables.

Applicants' arguments have been considered but are not found persuasive. Although the concentrations of asparagine, sodium chloride, selenite, wheat hydrolysate, insulin are not recognized in the prior art as result-effective variables, it would have been well within the ability of one of skill of the art to optimize and the concentrations for each component of the serum free media recited in the claims of the instant application. For instance the claims recite that insulin has a concentration of about 2.5 to about 6mg/L while the reference by Shibuya et al. discloses an insulin concentration of 5 mg/L and the reference. The concentration of insulin in the instant application overlaps with the concentration disclosed in the reference by Shibuya et al.

In addition, the claimed concentration for sodium chloride (also called sodium chloride) about 3,000 to about 4,500 mg/L overlaps with the one disclosed by Ciccarone et al. is 600-16,000 mg/L (see table disclosed at page 7 of the response filed 05/05/2008). Moreover, although the concentrations of sodium chloride have a different range from the one cited in the reference by Ciccarone et al., it would have been well within the ability of one of skill in the art to optimize the concentration of sodium chloride for the cultivation of cells producing IL-18BP.

Finally, the MPEP (2144.05) discloses that differences in concentration or temperature will not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence indicating such concentration or temperature is critical. "[W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or

Art Unit: 1647

workable ranges by routine experimentation." *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955) see MPEP 2144.05.

At page 7 of the response, Applicants argue that the medium by Shibuya et al. teaches that glutamine is present in the media disclosed therein and no basis for deleting this component is provided in the Office Action. In addition, Applicants argue that there is not articulated reason in the Office Action to omit glutamine from the media taught by Shibuya et al.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Although the reference by Shibuya et al. does not disclose a motivation to omit glutamine as one of the component of serum free media, the addition or removal of glutamine would have been well within the ability of one of skill in the art to optimize the serum free medium for the cultivation of cells producing IL-18BP.

At page 8 of the response, Applicants argue that the current rejection is based upon improper hindsight reconstruction of the claimed invention.

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the

Art Unit: 1647

applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

In the instant case, the components for the serum free medium for the cultivation of cells producing IL-18BP are well within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made. For instance, the references by Shibuya et al. and Ciccarone et al. teach all the components of the serum free medium claimed in this instant application. In addition, the optimization for the concentrations of each component is well within the level of ordinary skill in the art. Thus, the Examiner has not used any improper hindsight reconstruction of the claimed invention, since it would have been well within the ability of one of skill in the art to optimize the serum free medium for the cultivation of cells producing IL-18BP.

### Conclusion

No claim is allowed.

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 1647

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

### **Information**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to IAN DANG whose telephone number is (571)272-5014. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9am to 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Manjunath Rao can be reached on (571) 272-0939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ian Dang  
Art Unit 1647  
June 24, 2008

/Manjunath N. Rao, /  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1647